

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE s Patent and Trademark Office MISSIONER FOR PATENTS 0.78 450 dda, Virginia 22313-1450 spio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/743,729	12/24/2003	Ikuko Kobayashi	500.43372X00	9095	
24956	24956 7590 09/14/2006			EXAMINER	
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.			HENNING, MATTHEW T		
1800 DIAGO SUITE 370	NAL ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDR	IA, VA 22314		2131		
		DATE MAIL ED. 00/14/200	4		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summan	10/743,729	KOBAYASHI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Matthew T. Henning	2131			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Ju	ılv 2006				
	action is non-final.				
<i>7</i> —	nce except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E					
Disposition of Claims	·				
4) Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-14,16 and 17</u> is/are pending in	the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-14,16 and 17</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r				
· <u> </u>		ed to by the Evaminer			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 December 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
		• •			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Trib The batth of declaration is objected to by the Ex	animer. Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO-132.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> </ul>					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicati	on No			
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the prior</li></ol>	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage			
application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	·			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6)					

Page 2

Art Unit: 2131

1	This action is in response to the communication filed on 7/25/2006.
2	DETAILED ACTION
3	Response to Arguments
4	Applicant's arguments, see Page 15 Paragraph 2 and Page 17 Paragraph 2, filed
5	7/25/2006, with respect to the independent claims have been fully considered and are persuasive.
6	The previous prior art rejections of the claims have been withdrawn.
7	Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 16-17 have been examined.
8	All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.
9	Specification
10	The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the
11	claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the
12	following is required: Although there is support in the specification for no bandwidth control
13	being executed by the stream server when the client is connected through the Internet, there is no
14	support for the limitation of not executing bandwidth control anywhere for the client connected
15	through the Internet. See the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112 1st Paragraph.
16	
17	Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112
18	The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
19 20 21 22 23 24	The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/743,729

Art Unit: 2131

•

Page 3

Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Although there is support in the specification for no bandwidth control being executed by the stream server when the client is connected through the Internet, there is no support for the limitation of not executing bandwidth control anywhere for the client connected through the Internet. As such, the claims are rejected for failing to meet the written description requirement of 35 USC 112 1st Paragraph.

Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification provides enablement for a steam server to not execute bandwidth control for a client connected to the server through the Internet. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of how to ensure that there is no bandwidth control executed throughout "the second network", which includes the Internet. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would be unable to make the invention as claimed including wherein bandwidth control is not executed. Therefore, the claims are rejected for failing to meet the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph. The examiner suggests pointing out that the lack of bandwidth control is limited to the stream server.

Application/Control Number: 10/743,729 Page 4

Art Unit: 2131

1	The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
2 3 4 5	The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
	Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as
. 6	being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which
7	applicant regards as the invention.
8	Claims 1, 11, 12, and 13 all lack proper punctuation, which renders the scope of the claim
9	unclear.
10	In the preamble of claim 1, it is unclear whether the second network comprises the
11	limitations to follow, or whether it is the stream server apparatus that comprises the limitations.
12	The examiner suggests changing the preambles of the independent claims to read similar to the
13	following: "A stream server apparatus connected to a first network and a second network, the
14	stream server apparatus comprising:".
15	Claim 1 recites the limitation "said client apparatus" in lines 27-29, and 32-34 of the
16	marked up claim. There is multiple antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. As such,
17	one of ordinary skill in the art would be unable to determine which client apparatus is being
18	referred to by the limitation, and as such renders the scope of the claim unclear. Independent
19	claims 11-13 contain the same issue and are rejected for the same reason.
20	Claims 3-9 and 14, and 16-17 are rejected by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, and
21	11-13.
22	Allowable Subject Matter
23	The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of potentially allowable subject
24	matter: The prior art, particularly Even et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0114612

Application/Control Number: 10/743,729

Art Unit: 2131

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 A1), disclosed a network of the same structure as claimed, including the first and second

2 networks, the first and second clients, the first and second and third paths, and the stream server,

and the multiple interfaces, as seen in Even Fig. 2. Even further disclosed choosing the paths

4 based on the client locations and the type of communication as seen in Even Paragraphs 0028-

0030 and 0040-0041. However, Even did not disclose the use of bandwidth management.

Bandwidth management is well known in the art, and in general would have been obvious. However, the particular combination of limitations as claimed, including bandwidth control for a client on one network and not for a client on another network by the use of dummy port numbers, has not been taught or suggested by the prior art.

10 Conclusion

11 Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 16-17 have been rejected.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2131

l	Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
2	examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790.
3	The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

13

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

Matthew Henning

- 17 Assistant Examiner
- 18 Art Unit 2131
- 19 9/7/2006

/ AYAZ SHEIKH

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100